

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/538,351	Applicant(s) RABAROT ET AL.	
	Examiner Monique R. Jackson	Art Unit 1794	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Monique R. Jackson. (3) ____.

(2) Benjamin Prebyl. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 02 December 2008.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: All pending.

Identification of prior art discussed: Miyagawa et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: No agreement was reached in terms of patentability. A discussion to place with regards to recently submitted amendments and arguments over the teachings of Miyagawa et al, particularly with respect to the thickness layer combination and negative on negative resist layers.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Monique R Jackson/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1794	
--	--